DOCKET NO.: 210136US99



#9/ELE. 4/16/3 Sunter

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

**GROUP ART UNIT: 2815** 

RAVINDRANATH DROOPAD ET AL

SERIAL NO.: 09/901,109

**EXAMINER: BAUMEISTER** 

FILED: JULY 10, 2001

FOR: STRUCTURE AND METHOD FOR FABRICATING SEMICONDUCTOR STRUCTURES AND DEVICES UTILIZING THE FORMATION OF A COMPLIANT SUBSTRATE COMPRISING AN OXYGEN-DOPED COMPOUND SEMICONDUCTOR LAYER

## **RESTRICTION RESPONSE**

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

SIR:

This is responsive to the Restriction Requirement dated January 7, 2003.

## RPR 10 2003 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 280(

## **REMARKS**

The claims in this case were restricted into several Groups and Species. Applicants provisionally elect Group I, and Species IA, Claims 87-98 and 112-114 reading on, at least, Claims 1-13, 27-29, 87-98, 108 and 112-114.

The Office Letter characterizes the identified Groups of claims as being related, for example, as "process of making and product made." Referring to MPEP §806.05(f), the Office Letter takes the position that the product could be made by forming layers on temporary substrates followed by wafer-bonding. Separate utility in a certain device is provided as evidence of separate utility. While not taking a position with regard to the Examiner's comments, Applicants submit that the statements in the Office Letter do not meet the requirements set out in MPEP.

In this case there is no explanation in the Restriction Requirement as to why the